1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10	GEORGE C. SWINYER, JR.,	
11	Plaintiff,	Case No. C04-5348RBL
12	V.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
13	MICHAEL COLE, et al.,,	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16	The Court, having reviewed Plaintiff's requ	est for reconsideration, (Dkt. #37), the pleadings filed in
17	support and in opposition thereto, and the balance of the record, does hereby find and ORDER:	
18	(1) Local Rule CR 7 states:	
19	Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in	
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>	the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.	
22	Plaintiff has not submitted any new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the	
23	court's attention earlier, nor has he shown any manifest error in the court's prior ruling.	
24	At issue is plaintiff's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. #. 34), which was denied based on	
25	plaintiff's failure to show the court he had made reasonable efforts to consult with the other party or	
26	counsel prior to filing the motion to compel. In his motion for reconsideration, plaintiff states he has made	
27	contact with defense attorney, Dennis Hunter, with regard to the discovery matter.	
28	This evidence should have been presented earlier and plaintiff does not explain why it was not. In	

Page - 1

## Case 3:04-cv-05348-RBL Document 38 Filed 01/14/05 Page 2 of 2

addition, this evidence is more properly presented in a new motion for discovery, which must be filed and served on defendant and any opposing party, not in a motion for reconsideration. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**. If the information sought be plaintiff has been properly requested, per an appropriate discovery request, and plaintiff has complied with Rule 37(a), and plaintiff has not received an appropriate response, plaintiff may wish to file a new motion to compel.

/s/ J. Kelley Arnold
J. Kelley Arnold

United States Magistrate Judge

DATED this 14th day of January, 2005.

ORDER Page - 2